

with the determined physical location further comprising: ~~includes the step of:~~

retrieving from a database the preconfigured policy settings associated with the ~~port~~ physical location of the new network device.

9. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium containing program instructions for automatically configuring devices in a network, the program instructions for:

~~(a)~~ associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the network;

~~(b)~~ automatically detecting when a network device is plugged into the network and determining a location of the device in the network; and

~~(c)~~ automatically configuring the device based on the policy settings associated with the corresponding location.

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this patent application. Applicants have amended claims 1-9. Claims 10-24 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested.

Present Invention

A method for automatically configuring devices in a network is disclosed. The method comprises associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the network; automatically detecting when a network device is plugged into the network and determining a location of the device in the network; and automatically configuring the device based on the policy settings associated with the corresponding location.

Rejections – Specification

The Examiner has stated,

3. "The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 13, line 13 of the specification recites the phrase ". . . from the router 16 to the *switches* 16 that traverse the network..." The examiner believes that the applicant is referring the switches of block number 18 in fig. 1. Appropriate correction is required."

Applicant has replaced "switches 16" with "switches 18" and therefore submits that the objection has been overcome.

Objections – Claims

The Examiner has stated,

6. "Claims 4 and 12 recite the limitation "the switches". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claims 8, 16 and 24 recites the limitation "the port location". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of examination, the examiner treats it as "a location" as recited on their independent claims."

Applicant has added proper antecedent basis for the term "switches" in claims 4 and 12 and have also replaced "the port location" with "a location" in claims 8, 16, and 24.

Rejections — 35 U. S . C . §103(a)

The Examiner has stated,

9. "Claims **1-3, 8-11, 16-19** and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cochran et al. (Publication no.: US 2002/10161867 A1)** in view of **Burnett et al. (Publication no.: US 2003/10018889 A1)**

With respect to **claim 1**, Cochran teaches a method for automatically configuring devices in a network (Cochran, fig. I), comprising:

(b) automatically detecting when a network device is plugged into the network (Cochran, page 4, paragraph 38, noted that configuration assembly 12 automatically identifies new computing devices) and determining a location of the device in the network (Cochran, page 5 paragraph 41, noted the identification system for physically locating the computing device); and

(c) automatically configuring the device based on the policy settings associated with the corresponding location (Cochran, page 5, paragraph 40, noted that once the desired computing device has been identified, it is automatically configured).

However, Cochran does not explicitly teach a method of associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the network. In the same field of endeavor, Burnett teaches a method of associating a factory default configuration firmware with devices in the network (Burnett, page 2, paragraph 28, noted the factory default configuration.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of associating a factory default configuration firmware with devices in the network as taught by Burnett in Cochran's invention in order to provide the basic utilities to operate the devices and further configure it as needed.

With respect to **claim 2**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) further includes the step of: displaying a configuration screen that allows the user to create different policy settings that specify what configuration actions are to be taken (Cochran, fig 3, and page 5, paragraph 42, noted the user interface 132).

With respect to **claim 3**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 2 wherein, step (a) further includes the step of: saving the policy settings in a database (Cochran, pages 4-5, paragraph 39).

With respect to **claim 8**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) further includes the step of: retrieving from a database the policy setting associated with the location of the new device (Cochran, page 6, paragraph 47, noted that once the device is detected, it is automatically configured. Which implies that the configuration assembly 12 has retrieved the configuration setting from the database 120).

Consider **claim 9**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 1, but rather in computer program stored in a computer-readable medium form. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 1 is used to reject claim 9. By this rationale **claim 9** is rejected.

Consider **claim 10**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 2. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 2 is used to reject claim 10. By this rationale **claim 10** is rejected.

Consider claim 11, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 3. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 3 is used to reject claim 11. By this rationale **claim 11** is rejected.

Consider **claim 16**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 8. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 8 is used to reject claim 16. By this rationale **claim 16** is rejected.

With respect to **claim 17**, Cochran teaches an automatic network configuration system, comprising:
a network (Cochran fig. 1);
a plurality of network devices connected to the network, including routers, and computers (Cochran fig. 1); and
a network management application executing on one of the devices for, automatically detecting when a device is plugged into the network (Cochran, page 4, paragraph 38, noted that configuration assembly 12 automatically identifies new computing devices) and determining a location of the device in the network (Cochran, page 5 paragraph 41, noted the identification system for physically locating the computing device) and
automatically configuring the device based on the policy settings associated with the corresponding location (Cochran, page 5, paragraph 40, noted that once the desired computing device has been identified, it is automatically configured).

However, Cochran does not explicitly teach a method of providing switches in the network and a method of associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the network.

In the same field of endeavor, Burnett teaches a method providing switches in the network (Burnett, page 1, paragraph 17) and a method of associating a factory default configuration firmware with devices in the network (Burnett, page 2, paragraph 28, noted the factory default configuration.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of providing more switches in the network and the method associating a factory default configuration firmware with devices in the network as taught by Burnett in Cochran's invention in order to provide more connections for the network segments and the basic utilities to operate the devices and further configure it as needed correspondingly.

Consider **claim 18**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 2. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 2 is used to reject claim 18. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

Consider **claim 19**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 3. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 3 is used to reject claim 19. By this rationale **claim 19** is rejected.

Consider **claim 24**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 8. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 8 is used to reject claim 24. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

Claims 4-7, 12-15, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cochran et al. (publication no.: US 200210161867 A1)** in view of **Burnett et al. (Publication no.: US 200310018889 A1)** and **Simpson et al. (Publication no.: US 200310014529 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 4**, the combined method of Cochran and Burnett teaches all the claimed limitations except that they do not explicitly teach the method of detecting and locating the network device by transmitting SNMP queries.

In the same field of endeavor, Simpson teaches the method of detecting and locating the network device by transmitting SNMP queries (Simpson, page 4, paragraph Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of detecting and locating the network device by transmitting SNMP queries as taught by Simpson in the combined method of Cochran and Burnett invention in order to use the benefit of the standard protocol.

With respect to **claim 5**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 4 wherein step (b) further includes the step of: determining which port on the network the device is plugged into (Cochran, pages 3-4, paragraph 34, noted the TCPIIP port).

With respect to **claim 6**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 5 wherein step (b) further includes the step of: detecting any combination of newly added devices including routers, switches, computers, and server blades (Cochran, page 4, paragraphs 37-38).

With respect to **claim 7**, Cochran teaches the method of claim 6 wherein step (b) further includes the step of: detecting processor blades and switches added to existing server blades (Cochran, page 4, paragraphs 37-38, noted the servers).

Applicants submit that claims 2-8 are also allowable since they depend either directly or indirectly upon an allowable base claim. In addition, Applicants note that the dependent claims are also allowable on their own merits.

Claim 9

Applicant submits that claim 9 is an independent claim that has similar limitations to that of independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned above, claim 9 should be allowable over the cited references.

Applicant submits that claims 10-16 are also allowable since they depend directly upon an allowable base claim. In addition, Applicants note that the dependent claims are also allowable on their own merits.

Claim 17

Applicant submits that claim 17 is an independent claim that has similar limitations to that of independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned above, claim 17 should be allowable over the cited references.

Applicant submits that claims 18-24 are also allowable since they depend directly upon an allowable base claim. In addition, Applicants note that the dependent claims are also allowable on their own merits.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below

/JOSEPH A. SAWYER, JR./

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.